

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

SANDERS LAMONT ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

-v-

VINCENT E. DOYLE, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**DECISION and ORDER**  
00-CV-0188S

Before the Court is plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the judgments and orders entered in this matter between October 23, 2000 and December 23, 2002, and for other related relief. (Docket No. 30). Plaintiff's claims against the numerous defendants in this case were dismissed by this Court on October 23, 2000 and January 25, 2002. (Docket Nos. 12, 17 and 20). Plaintiff's appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were dismissed on August 12, 2002 and June 26, 2003. (Docket Nos. 22 and 29). Accordingly, the Court considers plaintiff's submission to be a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), which provides relief from a final judgment, order, or proceeding when, for example, there has been a mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, or newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time.

Plaintiff's motion fails to provide any relevant information which would lead this Court to reconsider the orders dismissing plaintiff's claims. The motion can only be described as incoherent and nonsensical, with plaintiff's notice of motion and supporting affirmation consisting in large measure of scattershot references to and requests for

various forms of relief in a number of the many other meritless and vexatious lawsuits that plaintiff has filed in the federal courts in New York over the past seven years.

In short, the instant motion is entirely in keeping with what the Second Circuit has termed the petitioner's "uncontrollable propensity to pursue vexatious and harassing litigation," *Adams v. Selsky*, 03-0023, Mandate (2d Cir. Apr. 12, 2004) (citations omitted), and illustrates why this Court imposed upon petitioner the sanctions enumerated in the Orders entered in this matter on October 23, 2000 and December 23, 2002 (Docket Nos. 12 and 27), which plaintiff now seeks to have this Court revisit. Plaintiff's obstreperousness in continuing to seek to revive meritless lawsuits like the instant one contributed greatly to this Court's decision to impose additional sanctions upon him earlier this year in another of the many lawsuits he has filed in the Western District. See *Adams v. West*, 04-CV-0844S, (W.D.N.Y. 2005) (Docket Nos. 9 and 12). Accordingly, the petitioner's motion for reconsideration is denied.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 21, 2005  
Buffalo, New York

/s/William M. Skretny  
WILLIAM M. SKRETNY  
United States District Judge